

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Cervello et al, US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0071448. Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Cervello et al reference teaches the use of a Network Allocation Vector (NAV) in accordance with the standardized 801.11 protocol, **and** the use of an Overlapping Network Allocation Vector (ONAV) that is obtained solely from neighboring BSSs.

Addressing claim 1, it is noted that the last step of the claim specifies sending a signal (signal X), but in rejecting claim 1 the Examiner neglected to identify whether the Examiner asserts a correspondence between signal X and the NAV specification, or between signal X and the ONAV specification. However, since claim 1 specifies that signal X communicates a duration value that is “other than a time period for a predetermined subsequent message transmission” and since the NAC communicates a duration value that is equal to the time period of a predetermined subsequent message transmission, it follows that the choice that is more supportive of the Examiner’s position is the asserted correspondence is between signal X and the ONAV, and this is assumed herein. That is, it is presumed that the Examiner asserts that the NAV in applicant’s claim corresponds to the ONAV in the reference.

The Examiner asserts that paragraph 17 of the reference teaches the last step of claim 1, but applicants respectfully disagree. First, the last step of claim 1 specifies that an obeying station, in addition to updating its NAV, also records “a reason why the network allocation vector is updated.” Nothing like that is described in the cited passage, or anywhere else in the reference. Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that claim 1 is not anticipated by Cervello et al.

Second, the last step of claim 1 also specifies that the obeying station determines when to ignore a duration value of a subsequent signal sent during the contention free period and when to obey the duration value of the subsequent signal based upon the reason why the network allocation vector is updated. This notion is also totally absence in the cited passage, and also in the entire Cervello et al reference. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Cervello et al.

Since claim 1 is not anticipated by Cervello et al, it follows that claims 2-9, which depend on claim 1 are likewise not anticipated by Cervello et al.

Claim 10 specifies a machine readable medium that contains instructions, including an instruction that corresponds to the claim 1 step discussed above. For the reasons expressed in connection with claim 1, it is believed that claim 10 is also not anticipated by Cervello et al, and this belief extends to dependent claims 11-13.

Relative to claims 2-3 and 11-12 the Examiner asserts that paragraphs 17 and 36 teach the limitation of responding to a subsequent signal when the duration value of the subsequent signal is ignored. Applicant respectfully disagrees, and believes that neither of the paragraphs teaches the notion of ignoring the duration (of a contention free period) derived from any “subsequent signal;” and certainly not based on the recorded reason for the previous updating of the NAV.

Paragraph 17 is not quoted here because of its length, so it is merely noted that the cited passage is fairly complex and requires careful reading. It is possible that applicant misconstrued some of the teachings in this paragraph, and therefore, if the Examiner maintains the rejection, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner point to the specific sentence or sentences that teach the above-discussed behaviors of the obeying station.

As for paragraph 36, it states:

More particularly, the inventions disclosed herein utilize a work frame which could include and used in a conventional WLAN such as that shown in FIG. 1. Within the invention, the network frame starts with a beacon transmission from the access point (AP) to all the stations (STA) in the receiving range of the AP (as shown in FIGS. 2 and 3). The beacon includes the information about the time slot allocation for each STA, synchronization information and information about the AP itself, which is necessary for new STAs to associate with the AP.

Clearly, there is no mention in the above-quoted passage of any act of ignoring a duration value of a contention free period (and it is noted that the word “duration” or any synonym thereof is not even found in the passage; and the same is true for the word “ignore”).

In short, it is believed that neither paragraphs 17 and 36 nor any other passage in the Cervello et al reference teach the limitations of claims 2-3 and 11-12.

As for claims 4-9 and 13, the Examiner points to paragraphs 36 and 37 in support of the rejection. Claim 5 specifies giving unknown protocols preferential use of the

transmission medium when the transmission by the obeying station are suppressed. The reference, however, does not mention any protocols other than the fact that the disclosed protocol is a MAC protocol. In particular, it is quite clear that this notion is totally absent in the above-quoted paragraph 36 passage, and it is also missing from the below-quoted paragraph 37, which states:

FIG. 5 shows the exchange of the RTS/CTS frames during a CFP. Those skilled in the art will realize that we have ignored the short inter-frame space (SIFS) time between two exchanging frames, e.g., between RTS and CTS, for the simplicity of the explanation. The frame formats of RTS/CTS frames transmitted during the CFP are the same as the original frame formats defined in IEEE 802.11 specification. The only difference is the way to specify/update the Duration/ID field (time) as is set forth in the frame header. For the RTS/CTS during the CFP, the Duration/ID fields are calculated as follows. First, the Duration/ID of the RTS is:

Duration/ID in RTS frame (i.e., Dur1 in FIG. 5) =
[duration of CTS]+[duration of (Data+CF-Poll frame)]+[duration of CF-ACK].

Of the remaining claims, it is respectfully submitted that these two paragraph also do not teach anything about giving a preference to

- hidden stations, claim 6 specifies,
- critical transmissions, as claim 7 specifies,
- to some overlapping stations, as claim 8 specifies, or
- stations of an enhanced version of the standard, as claim 9 specifies

when transmissions by the obeying station are suppressed.

Dated: 2/10/06

Respectfully,
Matthew J. Sherman

By



Henry T. Brendzel
Reg. No. 26,844
Phone (973) 467-2025
Fax (973) 467-6589
email brendzel@comcast.net